UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/971,717	10/04/2001	David Ian Houlding	92717-319	3038

7590 06/28/2005

Gary B. Solomon
Jenkens & Gilchrist, P.C.
3200 Fountain Place
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75202-2799

EXAMINER	
SHIFERAW, ELENI A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/971,717	HOULDING, DAVID IAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eleni A. Shiferaw	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *14 and 23* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-22 and 24-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *05 April 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Final Rejection

Response to the applicant's Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to amended claims 1, 12, 19, and 26, and canceled claims 14 and 23 filed on October 4, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Regarding claims 12-13 and 15, arguments/amendment are not persuasive. The examiner would like to point out that this action is made final (MPEP 706.07).

b. Regarding claims 1-11, 14, and 16-26, applicant's arguments/amendments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. The examiner accepts the amended drawings.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant argues:

a. Chopra fails to teach, anticipate, or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 12, namely, at least one processor executing a stored interactive software application inside a browser, the executed interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element, wherein the at least one element is external to the browser and includes a component of

an underlying architecture of the client computing system (page 5 par. 3, 5, and page 6 par. 1).

b. Dependent claims 13 and 15 are allowable based upon their dependency on allowable claim 12 (page 6 par. 2).

c. Chopra and Brownell fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 19, namely, communicating data between at least one element and a browser and wherein the at least one element is external to the browser and includes a component of an underlying architecture of a client computing system (page 7 par. 4).

d. Dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 are allowable based upon their dependency on allowable claim 19 (page 8 par. 2).

However examiner disagrees with applicant.

Regarding argument (a), Chopra teaches a user device executing a stored interactive software application inside a browser (Chopra page 2 par. 0019), the executed interactive software application and the browser being in **communication with at least one element**, wherein the at least one element is **external to the browser** and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and page 3 par. 0024).

Regarding argument (b), examiner disagrees with applicant. Based on the arguments forth by the examiner for argument (a), the dependent claims stand as rejected.

Regarding argument (c), Chopra teaches communicating data between at least one element and a browser and wherein the at least one element is external to the browser and includes a component of an underlying architecture of a client computing system (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and page 3 par. 0024).

Regarding argument (d), examiner disagrees with applicant. Based on the arguments forth by the examiner for argument (a), (b), and (c), the dependent claims stand as rejected.

Rejections

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. Claims 12, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chopra (Pub. No.: US 2002/0128920 A1).

As per claim 12, Chopra teaches a system for providing security to a client computing system operating a browser in communication with an interactive software application maintained by a host computing system, said system comprising:

at least one processor in the client computing system operable to generate and communicate a request to download the interactive software application from the host computing system to the client computing system (Chopra page 1 par. 0007);

a memory operating in the client computing system to store the interactive software application downloaded in response to the download request, said at least one processor executing the stored interactive software application and the browser, the executed interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element(Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and page 3 par. 0024); and

wherein the at least one element is external to the browser and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024).

As per claim 13 Chopra teaches the method/system, wherein the communication includes issuing and receiving events (Chopra page 1 par. 0007).

As per claim 15 Chopra teaches the method/system, wherein the interactive software application is a Java applet (Chopra page 6 claim 36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 16-22, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chopra (Pub. No.: US 2002/0128920 A1) in view of Brownell (Pub. No.: US 2002/0169980 A1).

As per claim 19 Chopra teaches a method for providing security to a client computing system operating an interactive software application, said method comprising:

loading the interactive software application on the client computing system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024);

executing the interactive software application in a browser on the client computing system (Chopra page 1 par. [0006-0007], and page 3 par. 0024);

communicating data between the at least one element and browser (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and page 3 par. 0024); and

wherein the at least one element is external to the browser and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024).

Chopra does not disclose communicating a digital signature to the browser;

verifying the digital signature;

upon confirmation of the digital signature, opening a port of the browser for receiving data from at least one element;

However Brown teaches communicating a digital signature to the browser (Brownell page 6 par. 0072 and page 4 par. [0050-0054]);

verifying the digital signature (Brownell page 6 par. 0075 and page 4 par. [0050-0054]);

upon confirmation of the digital signature, opening a port of the browser for receiving data from at least one element (Brownell page 6 par. 0072 and page 4 par. [0050-0054]);

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Brownell within the system of Chopra because it would allow to authenticate and verify a user to further improve security (Brownell page 6 par. 0072).

As per claims 16 and 22 both Chopra and Brownell teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Brownell teaches the method/system, wherein the communication commences after verification of a digital signature, digital signature associated with the host (Brownell page 6 par. 0072 & 0075). The rational for combining are the same as claim 19 above.

As per claim 17 both Chopra and Brownell teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, the both teach the method/system, wherein the data includes a model representative of an underlying architecture of a software system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024, and Brownell page 4 par. 0050).

As per claim 18, and 25, both Chopra and Brownell teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, both teach the method/system, wherein the browser is a web browser (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and Brownell page 4 par. 0050).

As per claim 20, both Chopra and Brownell teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method, wherein the data includes at least one of events and requests (Chopra page 1 par. [0006-0007]).

As per claim 21, both Chopra and Brownell teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method, wherein the events and requests utilize the HTTP protocol (Chopra page 2 par. 0019).

As per claim 24, both Chopra and Brownell teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Brownell teaches the method, wherein the at least one element operates on the client side of a client firewall (Brownell page 5 par. 0056). The rational for combining is the same as claim 19 above.

7. Claims 1-11 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chopra (Pub. No.: US 2002/0128920 A1) in view of Thackston (Pub. No.: US 2002/0035450 A1).

As per claims 1 and 26 Chopra teaches a method for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host communication system across a network, said method comprising:

executing a browser on the client computing system (Chopra page 2 par. 0019);

communicating from the client to the host computing system (Chopra Fig. 1 No. 102 & 106), a request to download data to be displayed in the browser (Chopra page 1 par. 0007);

downloading the data from the host computing system to the client computing system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024);

loading an interactive software application in the browser, the interactive software application utilizing the data downloaded from the host computing system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024); and

executing the interactive software application in the browser on the client computing system, the interactive software application being in communication with at least one element outside the browser on the client side (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and page 3 par. 0024);

Chopra does not explicitly teach client side firewall.

However **Thackston** discloses client side firewall (Thackston page 3 par. 0029). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Thackston within the system of Chopra because it would allow to provide security so as to protect proprietary and sensitive data (Thackston page 3 par. 0029).

As per claim 2, Chopra, and Thackston teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method/system, wherein the communication includes issuing and receiving events (Chopra page 1 par. 0007).

As per claim 3 Chopra, and Thackston teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, teaches the method/system, wherein the at least one element includes at least one of a browser and an element of an underlying architecture (Chopra page 2 par. 0019).

As per claims 4, and 5 Chopra, and Thackston teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method/system, wherein the interactive software application is a Java applet (Chopra page 6 claim 36).

As per claims 6, Chopra, and Thackston teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Thackston teaches the method/system, wherein the communication commences after verification of a digital signature, digital signature associated with the host (Thackston page 9 par. 0101).

As per claim 7 Chopra, and Thackston teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Thackston teaches the method/system, further comprising:

reading a digital signature (Thackston page 9 par. 0101);

verifying the digital signature (Thackston page 9 par. 0101); and

opening a port of the browser to receive events from the at least one element (Thackston page 5 par. 0068).

As per claim 8 Chopra, and Thackston teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, Chopra teaches the method/system, wherein the data includes a model representative of an underlying architecture of a software system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024).

As per claim 9, Chopra, and Thackston teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method, wherein the browser operates a graphical user interface to display data communicated by the at least one element (Chopra page 2 par. 0017).

As per claim 10, Chopra, and Thackston teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method, wherein the data includes content and format information (Chopra page 3 par. 0024).

As per claim 11, Chopra, and Thackston teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, Copra teaches the method/system, wherein the browser is a web browser (Chopra page 2 par. 0019).

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni A. Shiferaw whose telephone number is 571-272-3867. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eleni Shiferaw
June 20, 2005

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100